

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/037,502	NOONAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Eron J. Sorrell	2182	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Eron J. Sorrell. (3)_____.

(2) David Hoffman (Reg. No. 54,174). (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 14 February 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,9,17, and 21.

Identification of prior art discussed: US Patent No. 6,233,634 to Clark.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Agreement was reached concerning the embedded bus master taught by Clark. The applicant argued that the FIFO prevented from overflowing by the embedded bus master of Clark is not the same FIFO that holds snooped data. Applicant also argued there is no signal generated when the FIFO that holds snooped data reached a predetermined threshold in the Clark reference. After carefully reviewing the Clark reference the Examiner agreed with the applicant's arguments..